

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended and claims 9-12 are added. Support for the amendment to the claim 1 and for the new claims may be found, for example, in the specification on page 10, lines 5-12 and on page 12, line 20 - page 13, line 13. No new matter is added.

I. Objection to the Specification

The Office Action objects to the specification due to an informality. By this Amendment, the specification is amended to reference FIG. 3 rather than FIG. 13 at page 10, line 16, in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0048413 to Kusunoki ("Kusunoki") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0002733 to Tsai et al. ("Tsai"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The relevant portion of claim 1 recites "... a noticing area calculation section that calculates a noticing area of an image which is an object for a trimming operation ... an image processing section that adjusts the image, the trimming scope, or the distribution ratio of the noticing area in the trimming scope or the template according to the method which is designated by the trimming rule designating section and according to the distribution ratio of the noticing area calculated by the noticing area calculating section, the image adjustment including enlarging, contracting, and rotating an image." Kusunoki and Tsai, individually or combined, do not teach or suggest such an image editing device.

The image editing device of the present application calculates a noticing area for use in a trimming operation. The noticing area calculation separates the image into a plurality of areas and categorizes the areas according to more than two noticing degrees (attractiveness).

Areas with the highest noticing degrees are selected and then combined into a unitary object that is subsequently centered within the chosen template. Once centered, this unitary object is manipulated by the image processing section according to trimming rules. For example, the image processing section may rotate or magnify the unitary object within the template according to the chosen trimming rule or rules.

Conversely, Kusunoki teaches an image editing device wherein an image is displayed on the main screen and the user chooses a template from a list of templates, which corresponds with the dimensions of the paper on which the image is to be printed. The user can then move this template to select which portion of the image is to be printed. Kusunoki does not teach a noticing area calculation using different noticing degrees to center an image in the template or an image processing section that manipulates the image according to the chosen template and trimming rules. Therefore, Kusunoki does not teach or suggest every feature of amended claim 1.

Moreover, FIG. 6 of Kusunoki et al. discloses the trimming of an image into a predetermined shape. Tsai et al. does not disclose or indicate designating a trimming rule. In contrast, in the image editing device of the present application, according to at least claim 1, the image adjustment, e.g., enlarging, contracting, or rotating an image, carried out by the image processing section is based not only on the shape of the noticing area and the shape of the trimming frame, but also on the relationship between the noticing area and the trimming shape. Kusunoki fails to disclose these features.

Tsai does not address the deficiencies of Kusunoki. Namely, Tsai does not teach an image editing device that uses noticing area calculations and an image processing section to center and manipulate a unitary object within a template according to the chosen template and trimming rules. Therefore, Kusunoki and Tsai, individually or combined, do not teach or

suggest every feature of amended claim 1. Independent claims 5 and 6 recite features similar to claim 1.


For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1, 5 and 6 would not have been rendered obvious by Kusunoki and Tsai. Claims 2-5 and 8-12 variously depend from claims 1, 6, and 7 and likewise would not have been rendered obvious by Kusunoki and Tsai. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Linda M. Saltiel
Registration No. 51,122

JAO:NAB/jth

Date: July 23, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--